

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Part I

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2003-2004



**DUE JANUARY 31, 2005
(REVISED APRIL 13, 2005)**

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
ROOM 229 STATE HOUSE
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2798**

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Indiana Department of Education

Address:

Room 229 State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jeffery P. Zaring

Telephone: 317-232-6622

Fax: 317-232-0744

e-mail: jzaring@doe.state.in.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Dr. Suellen Reed, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Signature

1/31/2005

Date

I. STANDARDS and ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

A. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

Indiana has adopted challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

B. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

STATE RESPONSE

In September 2004, Indiana administered English and mathematics assessments in Grades 3-10 and administered science assessments in Grade 5. Indiana conducted a pilot administration of a Grade 7 science assessment, which will be administered in Fall 2005. Indiana is conducting a pilot administration of a high school science test.

Indiana has adopted the Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting as its alternate assessment, aligned to alternate achievement standards and to grade-level achievement standards.

C. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

STATE RESPONSE

Indiana has set academic achievement standards in English, mathematics, and science for all operational tests.

Indiana has adopted a definition of "significant cognitive disability" and is in the process of adopting alternate achievement standards.

II. PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

A. Participation of All Students in 2003-2004 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2003-2004 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Student Participation in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration

2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	312,857	100
American Indian/Alaska Native	828	100
Asian/Pacific Islander	3,108	99
Black, non-Hispanic	37,531	99
Hispanic	12,369	99
White, non-Hispanic	251,830	100
Students with Disabilities	46,761 49143	
Limited English Proficient	6,710	
Economically Disadvantaged	102,344	
Migrant	89 253	
Male	159,037	100
Female	151,301	100

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	312,857	100
American Indian/ Alaska Native	828	100
Asian/ Pacific Islander	3,108	99
Black, non-Hispanic	37,531	99
Hispanic	12,369	99
White, non-Hispanic	251,830	100
Students with Disabilities	46,761 49143	
Limited English Proficient	6,710	
Economically Disadvantaged	102,344	
Migrant	89 253	
Male	159,037	100
Female	151,301	100

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

B. Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration

2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	46,761	100
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		

2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	46,761	100
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2,382	100

III. STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2003-2004 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2003-2004 school year. States should provide data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2003-2004 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Grade 3 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	71
American Indian/Alaska Native	66
Asian/Pacific Islander	84
Black, non-Hispanic	54
Hispanic	60
White, non-Hispanic	75
Students with Disabilities	40
Limited English Proficient	47
Economically Disadvantaged	60
Migrant	* <30 tested
Male	71
Female	71

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 3 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	74
American Indian/Alaska Native	71
Asian/Pacific Islander	85
Black, non-Hispanic	54
Hispanic	58
White, non-Hispanic	78
Students with Disabilities	44
Limited English Proficient	52
Economically Disadvantaged	61
Migrant	* <30 tested
Male	71
Female	78

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 6 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	72
American Indian/Alaska Native	66
Asian/Pacific Islander	89
Black, non-Hispanic	43
Hispanic	58
White, non-Hispanic	78
Students with Disabilities	35
Limited English Proficient	56
Economically Disadvantaged	57
Migrant	* <30 tested
Male	72
Female	73

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 6 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	69
American Indian/Alaska Native	62
Asian/Pacific Islander	82
Black, non-Hispanic	45
Hispanic	53
White, non-Hispanic	74
Students with Disabilities	27
Limited English Proficient	47
Economically Disadvantaged	53
Migrant	* <30 tested
Male	64
Female	75

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 8 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	71
American Indian/Alaska Native	59
Asian/Pacific Islander	87
Black, non-Hispanic	39
Hispanic	55
White, non-Hispanic	76
Students with Disabilities	29
Limited English Proficient	51
Economically Disadvantaged	51
Migrant	* <30 tested
Male	70
Female	71

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 8 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	65
American Indian/Alaska Native	50
Asian/Pacific Islander	78
Black, non-Hispanic	38
Hispanic	47
White, non-Hispanic	69
Students with Disabilities	20
Limited English Proficient	40
Economically Disadvantaged	45
Migrant	* <30 tested
Male	60
Female	69

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

High School Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	67
American Indian/Alaska Native	54
Asian/Pacific Islander	85
Black, non-Hispanic	33
Hispanic	46
White, non-Hispanic	73
Students with Disabilities	27
Limited English Proficient	41
Economically Disadvantaged	46
Migrant	* <30 tested
Male	68
Female	66

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

High School Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	69
American Indian/Alaska Native	57
Asian/Pacific Islander	78
Black, non-Hispanic	39
Hispanic	44
White, non-Hispanic	75
Students with Disabilities	22
Limited English Proficient	26
Economically Disadvantaged	48
Migrant	* <30 tested
Male	65
Female	73

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

IV. SCHOOL and DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

A. For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	1843	1405	76%

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	297	136	46%

B. For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	789	628	80%

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	285	125	44%

C. Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2004-2005 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year, please mark "Made AYP 2003-2004."

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which school missed AYP						School Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/ middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Fort Wayne CSC 0235	Ben F. Geyer MS 0117	●				●		2
	Adams Elementary 0141*							2
	Study Elementary 0257	●				●		1
East Allen County CSC 0255	Meadowbrook Elem 0305*							3
	Village Elementary 0317	●						2
Comm Schools of Frankfort 1170	Samuel P. Kyger Elem 1001	●		●				2
Muncie CS 1970	Grissom Elementary 1470*							2
	Washington-Carver Elem 1515	●		●				3
Concord CS 2270	Concord West Side Elem 1729*							1
Elkhart CS 2305	Roosevelt Elem 1801	●		●				3
New Albany-Floyd Co CSC 2400	Lillian Emery Elem 1970	●		●				1
Franklin Co CSC 2475	Brookville Elem 2125*							2
Mississinewa CSC 2855	R J Baskett MS 2335*							2
Marion CS 2865	Frances Slocum Elem 2409*							2
New Castle CSC 3445	Eastwood Elem 2832*							1

Jennings Co SC 4015	North Vernon Elem 3397*							1
Vincennes CSC 4335	George Rogers Clark 3557*							2
Warsaw CSC 4415	Jefferson Elem 3661*							1
Gary CSC 4690	Lew Wallace HS 4029	•	•	•	•		•	3
	Theodore Roosevelt HS 4033	•	•	•	•		•	3
	Tolleston MS 4037	•		•				3
	William A Wirt HS 4041	•		•				1
	Beveridge Elem 4061*							3
	Brunswick Elem 4065*							2
	Washington Carver Elem 4069	•		•				4
	Charles R Drew Elem 4081	•	•	•	•			4
	David O Duncan Elem 4086*							2
	Ben Franklin Elem 4089*							3
	Ivanhoe Elem 4101	•				•		2
	Bailly MS 4103	•	•		•			3
	Kuny Elem 4109					•		3
	Alain L Locke Elem 4117*							3
	Arthur P Melton Elem 4125	•	•		•	•		4
	Dunbar-Pulaski MS 4145	•	•	•	•			3
	Pyle/Washington 4149*							2

	John H Vohr Elem 4157	•	•		•			2
	West Side HS 4163	•	•		•			3
	Daniel Webster Elem 4165*							1
School City of Hammond 4710	Lee L Caldwell Elem 4441					•		4
	Lafayette Elem 4461	•		•		•		4
Anderson CSC 5275	Robinson Elem 5123	•						2
MSD Lawrence Twp. 5330	Harrison Hill Elem 5289	•		•				2
MSD Perry Twp. 5340	Clinton Young Elem 5325*							1
	Abraham Lincoln Elem 5337	•		•				1
	Winchester Village Elem 5351	•						2
MSD Pike Twp. 5350	Eastbrook Elem 5359*							1
Indianapolis Public Schools 5385	John Marshall MS 5494	•		•				1
	Forest Manor MS 5500	•		•		•		1
	Frederick Douglass MS 5519	•		•		•		3
	Florence Fay School 5521*							1
	Henry Longfellow MS 5528	•				•		4
	Riverside Elem 5544			•				3
	Clarence Farrington MS 5561	•						1
	Emma Donnan MS 5572	•		•		•		1
	Booth Tarkington 5592	•	•	•	•			2

	George Fisher 5593	•						1
	TC Steele 5598	•						1
	Julian D Coleman Elem 5610	•		•		•		4
	Margaret McFarland MS 5612	•		•				1
	George Washington Comm 5643	•	•	•	•	•		1
Monroe County CSC 5740	Fairview Elem 6197	•		•				1
Spencer-Owen CS 6195	Spencer Elem 6617	•						3
Portage Twp. Schools 6550	Paul Saylor Elem 6876	•		•				2
Jac-Cen-Del CSC 6900	Jac-Cen-Del Elem 7203*							1
Scott Co School Dist. 1 7230	Austin Elem 7630	•						2
North Judson-San Pierre SC 7515	North Judson-San Pierre Elem 7851*							3
Southwest SC 7715	Carlisle Elem & JH 7953*							1
	Sullivan Elem 7965	•						2
Evansville-Vanderburgh SC 7995	Lincoln Elem 8251	•		•				2
	John M Culver Elem 8281	•		•				3
	Evans MS 8291	•		•				4
	Glenwood MS 8301	•						4
	Harwood MS 8313	•		•				4
Warrick Co SC 8130	Boonville JH 8793	•						1
	Chandler Elem 8813	•						1

Nettle Creek SC 8305	Hagerstown Elem 8989	•						1
Western Wayne Schools 8355	Western Wayne Elem 8971*							1
	*made AYP							

D. Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action).

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/ middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Fort Wayne Community Schools	●		●				1
East Allen County Schools	●						1
Bartholomew Con School Corp	●						1
New Albany-Floyd Co Con Sch	●		●				1
Huntington Co Com Sch Corp	●						1
Warsaw Community Schools			●				1
School City of East Chicago	●		●				1
Gary Community School Corp							1
School City of Hammond	●		●				1
Alexandria Com School Corp	●						1
Anderson Community School Corp	●		●				1
M S D Pike Township							1
Indianapolis Public Schools	●		●				1

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
	Proficiency Target	Participatio n Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/ middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Monroe County Comm. School Corp.	●						1
Crawfordsville Comm. Schools	●		●				1
Spencer-Owen Comm. Schools	●						1
Tell City-Troy TownshipSchools			●				1
Rush County Schools	●		●				1
South Bend Community School Corporation	●		●				1
Southwest School Corp.	●		●				1
Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corp.	●		●				1
Warrick County School Corp.	●		●				1

2. Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools and districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

2004-2005 STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT Initiatives for School Support and Improvement

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) established a Technical Assistance Planning (TAP) Team to develop its statewide system of support based on the findings of a year-long research collaborative project with CCSSO and NCREL. This cross-department IDOE team was charged with using the findings of that research to make recommendations as to:

- Targeting districts and schools for assistance;
- Developing strategies for delivering technical assistance to LEAs with low-performing schools, including school support/assistance teams;
- Identifying financial and personnel resources to support technical assistance activities;
- Considering training and brokering technical assistance providers/mentors to tailor services in individual LEAs/schools, rather than SEA direct assistance;
- Developing the content and format of technical assistance to low-performing schools; and
- Making recommendations for the management, oversight, and implementation of the Statewide System of Support for Low-Performing Schools and Districts.

School Improvement Teams will concentrate their efforts on:

- Working to ensure district level support and participation;
- Assisting LEAs/schools in the use of data to determine the areas of highest need;
- Redeveloping the school's improvement plan to focus on highest areas of need using scientifically based research strategies;
- Assisting districts and schools in leveraging resources; and
- Assessing and evaluating the work so that the team, school, school district and others can learn what is working and share that information.

Improvement Team Membership: Key IDOE staff members act as team leaders and as a point of contact for the identified schools. The leaders organize a team that includes representatives from the community or region such as the district superintendent, members of governing bodies, teachers and principals from high-performing schools, IDOE staff with expertise in areas of identified need, special consultants or advisors (School Improvement Mentors).

School Improvement Mentors: Over 30 school improvement mentors are participating in a year-long training initiative developed and provided by MCREL. Diane Paynter is conducting the training aligned to the research findings of Robert Marzano's *What Works*. {Note: this project is based on the successful *TOPHAT II Consortium/MCREL Initiative* described later in this document.}

School Improvement Provider Database:

- A *comprehensive* web-based site will be available for use by district personnel to identify highly-qualified experts to provide technical assistance specific to the identified content or population needs of districts and schools;
- Information in the database, accessible to all school districts, will provide information that will allow districts and schools to be good consumers; and

- Simple searchability for the users will allow them to find providers that most closely match their need.

Indiana's nationally-recognized **ASAP website** at <http://www.doe.state.in.us> is an invaluable school improvement tool for all school districts and school community members. This *Accountability System for Academic Progress* website features comprehensive, user-friendly, resources in the domains of: Academic Standards; Accountability; Accreditation; Best Practice; Professional Development; School Data; School Improvement Plan; and the State Profile.

Indiana Principals Leadership Academy (IPLA): The Academy is a national model for the training of principals as leaders of instructors. Through Academy experiences and educational challenges, these leaders are empowered with effective behaviors and standards. Graduates of the IPLA set the pace for statewide educational improvement and reform, and are recognized as exemplary educational leaders in Indiana and throughout the country. The IPLA is committed to strengthening the leadership of administrators. Focusing on people, the Academy provides innovative and uncompromising quality services for educational leaders to improve school communities.

The goals of the Academy are to:

- Identify and select principals who have demonstrated a potential for professional self-growth and to develop that potential through an intensive and exciting program. This self-perpetuating cadre of school administrators serve as facilitators and trainers for other administrators and teachers;
- Create an excitement for continuous growth of Academy graduates;
- Ensure school effectiveness by developing leaders of instructors as well as managerial technicians; and
- Strengthen leadership skills through exposure to and in-depth application of such administration themes as leadership styles, school culture, school improvement, and communication.

Title I LEA/School Improvement Grant Awards: This grant distributes funds to qualified school districts for the purpose of providing intensive assistance to schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I, section 1116 of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Recipients must use the funds to improve student achievement by supporting the implementation of research-based strategies and practices.

To be eligible, a district must have one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action, or have been identified for LEA improvement. Criteria designed to give priority to school districts serving the lowest-achieving schools and demonstrating the greatest need for funds are used to rank need and allocate resources. The list of LEAs and schools identified for improvement and the rubric used to rank and allocate funds for 2004-05 are posted at <http://www.doe.state.in.us/TitleI/welcome.html>. Also available on this site is a Consultant List/Database which lists onsite technical assistance providers with diverse experience and expertise. (This site is the predecessor to the IDOE's new, comprehensive *Provider Database*).

Title I Schoolwide Planning and Implementation Support System: A schoolwide program planning *overview meeting* is held during the spring for representatives from all districts with schools eligible to become a Title I schoolwide program (SWP). Eligibility for SWP

participation is based on a poverty threshold of 40 percent or greater and the decision of school staff to fully participate in an SEA-approved schoolwide planning process.

Planning team meetings are held four times during the school year in Indianapolis. Each participating school sends a team of six to eight members, consisting of the principal, Title I program administrator or district coordinator, Title I-funded building staff, parents, and building level teachers representing various grades or disciplines. Each team meeting focuses on a specific aspect of the SWP planning process:

- September: Two-day workshop where consultants reinforce the process for conducting the comprehensive needs assessment, interpreting ISTEP+ test reports, analyzing student performance data, and writing findings. School teams develop specific plans for conducting their SWP needs assessments.
- November: Two-day workshop on the inquiry process where schools begin to consider research-based effective practices that have potential for addressing their needs.
- February: Two-day workshop where emphasis is on completing the inquiry process and developing goals and strategies. Participants share outcomes from initial steps of inquiry, develop a process for reviewing current programming related to effective practices and guiding principles identified through inquiry, link effective practices/guiding principles to key findings from the CNA, learn strategies for developing school-wide goals and strategies, and learn to use tools for reaching consensus and making decisions.
- April: Emphasis is on finalizing and operationalizing the draft SWP plan. Participants share draft goals and strategies, discuss systems for monitoring student performance, and plan for implementation on an ongoing basis. Consultants introduce frameworks for formative assessment and professional development.

Four on-site technical assistance visits are held at each participating school. The technical assistance team meets with the SWP planning team and district staff to respond to their unique needs and monitor the planning process. A *notebook system* is used to document and support the planning process. One notebook holds planning resources and tools (e.g., key research, professional journal articles, government reports, legal requirements, forms, and advanced organizers). A second notebook is used for organizing and revising sections of the developing SWP plan throughout the year.

After the planning year, SWP program *support is sustained through Implementation Years 1-5*. Year 1 and Year 2 implementing schools receive two 1-day group meetings during the year, and each school receives three full-day onsite technical assistance visits. The consultants assist the school teams in conducting an ongoing process for monitoring SWP plan implementation and the impact on student achievement. Teams also receive opportunities to share information with one another. Team meetings focus on data collection tools/process, analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, use of rubrics, formative and summative assessment process. Those SWPs in Implementing Years 3-5 participate in two group meetings to support their capacity to sustain continuous, ongoing school improvement.

Comprehensive School Reform Support (CSR) System: The CSR project provides technical assistance for 33 subgrantees during the 2004-05 program year. This technical assistance supports the implementation of the core components of their CSR designs and includes: curriculum and instructional practices; parent and community involvement; and the creation of a supportive school and district environment. In addition, schools receive technical assistance (a 2-

day session in the fall; and a 1-day session in the spring) to monitor checkpoints for impact on student achievement and implementation of the plan within the CSR school. The assistance includes data analysis for student performance, implementation of research-based strategies, and continuous job-embedded professional development. This technical assistance aligns with the support provided to schools identified for school improvement and eligible for Reading First so that high poverty schools in need of improvement will have available to them the resources and technical assistance necessary for continuous improvement.

Indiana Student Achievement Institute (InSAI): IDOE and InSAI have formed a consortium serving low-performing schools. Priority is given to schools identified as in need of improvement. The purpose is to raise student achievement in Indiana's schools through a whole school reform process. The mission of InSAI is to enable school-community teams to establish a local culture that promotes high expectations, sound guidance, effective teaching, a supportive environment, and high student achievement.

Teams of six (administrator, counselor, two teachers, parent, and business representative) attend the InSAI sessions over a two-year period (six session in the first year). Between sessions, teams complete tasks with the entire faculty, student body, and representatives of community stakeholder groups. Teams are supported by substantial technical assistance.

The process is vision-based, data-driven, and includes a local analysis of seventeen force fields that influence achievement. High-leverage strategies are implemented within targeted force fields. Each strategy is supported by a strategy plan, a resistance plan, a professional development plan, and an evaluation plan.

TOPHAT II Consortium (MCREL Initiative): The TOPHAT II consortium is comprised of 21 low-performing schools in Indiana that work with the Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning lab (MCREL) and IDOE over a two-year period to improve student achievement. The organizational structures that support the consortium are: consortium planning sessions; mentor training; site visits; leadership team training; building-level leader training; coaches training, onsite training, after-action reviews; and website support.

At the beginning of the year, administrators and mentors meet with MCREL staff to determine the needs of the consortium members and to plan the Leadership Training session and site visits for the upcoming year. The mentors are outside state-sponsored consultants and internal IDOE consultants who are assigned specific schools. While the IDOE is the convening agency for this process, MCREL delivers the content.

The *MCREL Leadership Training* sessions occur three times per year (6 days total). The District Leadership Team consists of teachers, administrators, board members, principals, and the Title I program administrator. These sessions take place in the autumn, spring, and summer of the school year. Team meeting time is provided to process what teams have learned and to plan how to disseminate and implement the content in their schools.

The *MCREL Mentor Training* session occur three times per year. Mentors meet with

MCREL staff before and after the formal training sessions to discuss the progress their sites are making and to address current issues and concerns. *Mentors provide* technical assistance with at least *six onsite visits*. *Site visits by MCREL consultants* also are scheduled two times per year to visit school sites and reinforce their efforts and to address their specific issues related to the implementation of standards-based practices.

E. PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

1. Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year.

61

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 167 How many of these schools were charter schools?

0

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 1,199

4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 45,711 students enrolled in schools in school improvement

2. Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 49

(Includes 5 schools who were in Year 1 but offered SES a year early due to lack of other schools in the same grade span (and not in school improvement) within the district)

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year.

3,064

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental

OMB NO. 1810-0614

educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year.

16,228

V. TEACHER and PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

A. Highly Qualified Teachers. NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

1. In the following table, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	220,002	211,389	96.1
By Poverty Status			
High-Poverty Schools	59,050	55,582	94.1
Low-Poverty Schools	48,221	46,731	96.9
By Level			
Elementary	122,091	117,274	96.1
Secondary	96,720	93,296	96.5

2. Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty schools used in the table above.

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
State Poverty Quartile Breaks	More than <u>36.3</u> %	Less than <u>12.5</u> %
Poverty Metric Used	Free/Reduced Meals	

3. Please provide the State's definition of elementary and secondary school level as used in the chart above.

a. Elementary Level

Contains a grade no higher than Grade 5

b. Secondary Level

Contains any grade 6 or higher

B. High-Quality Professional Development. In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2003-2004 School Year	100%

C. Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2003-2004 School Year	73%

VI. English Language Proficiency

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Please provide an updated description of the State's progress since September 1, 2003, in developing and implementing ELP standards as required under section 3113(b)(2). Please describe the progress the State has made in linking the ELP standards to academic content in reading/language arts and mathematics. Provide a description of the State's progress in developing ELP standards that are linked to academic content in science. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**

STATE RESPONSE

The September 1, 2003 Consolidated Application Submission describes the links of the ELP Standards to English/LA and mathematics and how the ELP Standards address K-12 in the five domains. The implementation of Indiana's K-12 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards has progressed well since the 9-1-03 submission. Based on what works best in each school corporation, LEAs have selected a variety of methods, including unwrapping the standards and identifying direct links to content area instruction, to implement the ELP Standards. The response to the ELP Standards from teachers, schools, and LEAs has been very positive. The following timeline indicates Indiana's progress since 9-1-03:

- Nov 03
 - ELP Standards were presented to the Indiana State Board of Education
 - ELP Standards were posted online at: <http://www.doe.state.in.us/lmmp/standards.html>
- Mar 04
 - Hard copies of the ELP Standards were distributed to schools state wide
 - John Carr of WestED, who assisted in the development of the ELP Standards, provided a technical assistance workshop for teachers at the K-12 ESL Conference
- July 04
 - SEA staff attended professional development at an LEA to observe their development of a plan to implement the ELP Standards
- Aug 04
 - Fall 2004 Title III Administrative Workshops were provided by the SEA regionally at seven (7) sites across the State for technical assistance to LEAs on the implementation of ELP Standards and strategies used by sample LEAs to incorporate document into instruction
- Nov 04
 - SEA provided on-site technical assistance to several LEAs individually on the implementation of ELP Standards

In addition to the implementation that has occurred to this point, the SEA plans to provide another technical assistance workshop for teachers specific to linking the ELP Standards to content area instruction at the next K-12 ESL Conference on March 14, 2005. The SEA will also provide technical assistance to LEAs as requested.

The Indiana Academic Standards define what all Indiana students, including students for whom English is a second language, are expected to know and be able to do in the academic content areas. The English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards are designed to guide limited English proficient (LEP) students through the process of English acquisition in a manner that is linked to the Indiana Academic Standards. This linking ensures that LEP students develop proficiency in the English language while simultaneously developing the academic concepts and skills contained in the Indiana Academic Standards. The ELP Standards provide all teachers with information they can use to ensure that English language development is occurring appropriately for all students, including LEP students who enter Indiana schools.

The ELP standards provide a foundation for LEP students by identifying grade appropriate performance indicators linked to the Indiana Academic Standards for English/LA, Mathematics, and Science. Because the indicators within the ELP standards integrate skills used in the Indiana Academic Standards, LEP students are exposed to the Indiana Academic Standards as they progress through the proficiency levels 1 through 5. For example, Standard 1: READING: Word Recognition, Fluency, and Vocabulary Development contains the indicator, ELP 8.1.9 – "Apply knowledge of root words, suffixes, and affixes to solicit meaning from some literary works and content-area texts" for Level 4 (Advanced). The ELP Standards are written in such a way that skills and concepts apply across the content areas.

B. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. Please describe how the State ensures:

- The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades K-12;
- The ELP assessment(s) address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension

2. If the State is using multiple ELP assessments, please describe how the State:

- Set technical criteria for the assessments (validity and reliability);
- Ensured the assessments are equivalent to one another in their content, difficulty, and quality;
- Reviewed and approved each assessment; and
- Ensured that data from all assessments can be aggregated for comparison and reporting purposes as well as disaggregated by ELP levels and grade levels

3. Please provide an updated description, including a timeline, of the State's progress in developing and implementing new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency standards as required by section 3113(b)(2)(C)(iii).

STATE RESPONSE

1. The SEA ensures annual assessment of all LEP students in grades K-12 in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension in several ways.
 - The SEA limits the selection of language proficiency assessment tools used by LEAs to three (3) State approved instruments (Woodcock-Muñoz, Language Assessment Scales (LAS), and Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). Although these instruments are not sufficient in their assessment of the five domains, they were used in SY 2003-04 as Indiana anticipates a transition to a newly developed instrument to be used state wide.
 - LEAs are required to sign an assurance ensuring their compliance with this requirement. Receipt of Title III funds is contingent upon the LEA's ability to carry out this requirement.
 - Data on English language proficiency assessment results submitted by the LEA to the SEA is monitored to ensure that the assessment is occurring.
 - The LEA submits an Annual Performance Report outlining how the requirement has been met.
2. Indiana is using three ELP assessments (Woodcock-Muñoz, Language Assessment Scales (LAS), and Idea Proficiency Test (IPT) until it transitions to a newly developed instrument to be used state wide. As described in Part B of the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Report, Indiana recognizes five (5) levels of English proficiency. The composite score for each student's ELP assessment is aligned to Indiana's defined five levels of English proficiency. Using standardized English proficiency levels ensures that the SEA can aggregate data for comparison and reporting purposes as well as disaggregated by ELP levels and grade levels.
3. Indiana is participating in the development of the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) through the LEP State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) project organized by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). This enhanced assessment was field tested in Spring 2004 resulting in one operational form. ELDA will be field tested again at grades K-12 during Spring 2005 to develop more operational forms. After the field test, Indiana will make a final determination the selection of a statewide instrument. The operational test will be administered in statewide Spring 2006.

C. English Language Proficiency Assessment Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2003-2004** school year test administration. English language proficiency data should include **all** students in the State who were assessed and identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments. The State must also disaggregate ELP data by number and percentage of students who participated in Title III programs.

The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level and should include the following:

1. Total number and percentage of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments)
2. Total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students

determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments)

3. Total number and percentage of all students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s)
4. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year
5. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III
6. Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2003-2004 school year.

States may use the sample formats below or another format to report the requested information.

Table C-1: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 1, 2, and 3 on the previous page

2003-2004 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State												
Name of LEP Assessment(s)	Total number and percentage of ALL Students Assessed (All LM students, LEP + FEP)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency							
					Number and Percentage at Beginner or Level 1	Number and Percentage at Early Intermediate or Level 2		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 3		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 4		
(1)	(2)		(3)		(4)	(5)		(6)		(7)		
Woodcock-Muñoz	21,162	46%	15,774	54%	2,146	7.4%	2,483	8.6%	5,193	17.9%	5,952	20.5%
Language Assessment Scales (LAS)	14,887	32%	9,551	33%	3,008	10.4%	1,410	4.9%	2,241	7.7%	2,892	10%
Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)	3,146	7%	1803	6%	343	1.2%	244	0.8%	459	1.6%	757	2.6%
Other	7,154	15%	1845	7%	187	0.6%	292	1%	438	1.5%	928	3.2%
STATE TOTAL	46,349	100%	28,973	100%	5,684	19.6%	4,429	15.3%	8,331	28.7%	10,529	36.3%

Revised 2-9-05**Table C-2: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 4, 5, and 6 on the previous page**

2003-2004 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III												
Name of LEP Assessment(s)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs(*)		Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring(**)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency							
					Number and Percentage at Beginner or Level 1		Number and Percentage at Early Intermediate or Level 2		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 3		Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 4	
(1)	(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)		(7)	
Woodcock-Muñoz	10,007	52%	#	%	2,024	38%	2,277	56%	4,770	62%%	6,067	51%
Language Assessment Scales (LAS)	7,121	37%	#	%	2,953	54%	1,375	33%	2,140	28%	4,287	36%
Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)	1,155	6%	#	%	343	6%	244	6%	458	6%	774	6%
Other	962	5%	#	%	125	2%	215	5%	303	4%	858	7%
STATE TOTAL	19,245	100%	1,924	7.04%	5,445	100%	4,111	100%	7,671	100%	11,986	100%

* The first column, total # and % students identified as LEP participating in Title III programs by assessment used, was recalculated on 2-9-05. Please disregard prior versions of this chart and utilize this updated version.

** For SY 2003-04, a State total for the # and % of LEP students transitioned is available. A breakdown of data is not available by assessment administered. This data will be collected for SY 2004-05.

D. Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111(c).

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2003-2004 | <u>11,130</u> |
| 2. Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2003-2004 | <u>2,584</u> |
| 3. Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2003-2004 | <u>6</u> |

E. Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:

- The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments
- A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English
- Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have occurred since 9-1-03.

F. Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English in Title III served schools as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have occurred since 9-1-03.

G. Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have occurred since 9-1-03.

H. Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State?

_____ Yes X No

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

STATE RESPONSE:

The progress made by all LEP students in Indiana in learning English and attaining English proficiency is monitored through annual data collection of all LEAs. Data on proficiency level is collected each March in order to evaluate the progress of all LEP students. When the newly developed ELDA test is implemented, the SEA will have a more valid measure of the progress in English proficiency of all LEP students.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected		Actual		Projected		Actual	
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
2003-2004 School Year								

I. Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort: K-12 LEP Students**

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

STATE RESPONSE:

As indicated in the Title III Biennial Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA), on December 1, 2004, Indiana Title III LEAs did very well in exceeding the projections for making progress and attaining English proficiency. The table below demonstrates this.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected		Actual		Projected		Actual	
2003-2004 School Year								
Level 1 Students	11.8%	2,964	19.6%	5,021	-		-	
Level 2 Students	11.6%	2,914	14.2%	3,628	-		-	
Level 3 Students	11%	2,763	25.5%	6,537	-		-	
Level 4 Students	4.6%	1,155	40.7%	10,415	4.6%	449.8	7.04%	1,924
	39%	9,796	100%	25,601	4.6%	449.8	7.04%	1,924
State Total								

J. Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2003-2004 School Year

1. Number of Title III subgrants	<u>63</u>
2. Number of Title III subgrants that met Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	<u>44</u>
3. Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives	<u>19</u>
4. Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives Due to large increases in the number of LEP Immigrant students	<u>2</u>

VII. Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2004-2005 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2004-2005 School Year	0

VIII. Graduation and Dropout Rates

A. Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2002-2003 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	91
American Indian/Alaska Native	85
Asian/Pacific Islander	97
Black, non-Hispanic	87
Hispanic	85
White, non-Hispanic	92
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	* <30
Male	90
Female	93

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

B. Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2002-2003 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

DROPOUT RATE

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	2.3
American Indian/Alaska Native	3.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.9
Black, non-Hispanic	3.4
Hispanic	4.0
White, non-Hispanic	2.0
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	2.6
Female	1.8

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.